

Congress, as we always do in a bipartisan way, work for our military and their families. We shall never forget the cost of freedom, and I know that the people in America feel as passionately as I do, that we need to always remember that those who wear the uniform, whether it is peacetime or wartime, must be supported and their families, with the quality-of-life issues, must be maintained adequately.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution recognizing the families of the members of the U.S. Armed Forces and supporting the designation of National Military Families Week.

I commend the gentleman from Arkansas for introducing this important tribute to the families of our brave men and women in Iraq, Afghanistan and along the front lines of the global war on terrorism. American families with sons and daughters deployed overseas deserve our recognition for the support and comfort they provide every day.

Nearly 40 percent of service men and women who are currently deployed or away from their permanent duty stations have left families with children, and there are over 3,000,000 family members and dependents of those serving on active duty and in the reserves. These families share unique challenges as they endure unpredictable recalls, extended tours of duty, and deployments that can be as frustrating and painful as recovering from the traumas of war and the readjustment to life back home.

By passing this resolution today, military families will know that America understands and appreciates the critically important link between the support they provide and the readiness of our troops. Having honored our fallen this past Memorial Day, we extend our appreciation to the active duty and reserve personnel, as well as their families, who continue making sacrifices to help our troops honor their commitments to the Armed Forces and to our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution and look forward to working toward providing military families the assistance they deserve for their many contributions and dedication to our troops.

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 159 because now it is more important than ever for our Nation to show our support for our warfighters. While our Armed Forces are engaged in struggles in Afghanistan against the terrorists that attacked our Nation—and deployed against insurgents in Iraq—they represent the interests of our Nation.

We are at war; and the people who carry the guns and go after our enemies have a job that is harder than any of us can imagine. This Nation asks our men and women in the armed service to carry out a mission in which their lives are frequently in danger. Many do not come home to their families' arms. The ones who do come home must cope with new realities in their lives, and in the lives of their families.

As a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee, there's a wisdom to our recruitment. First, you recruit a soldier. When he re-enlists, you recruit the whole family. Much of our retention problems stem from families simply not being able to handle the emotional strain of a loved one serving, plus the financial detriment military service can present.

While loved ones are away serving our Nation in uniform, families are left with only one parent and all the responsibility of the family. In the case of National Guard and Reserve service members, it nearly always leaves the family with much less earning power and the entire family must make do with less. This breeds a number of challenges for military families.

While we in Congress must do all we can to help those families financially and with appropriate health care and other quality of life components . . . the least we can do today is to have a special week to recognize the difficulties that our military families live through every day. We must remember their sacrifices every day, but it is useful and educational to take a week to officially honor the sacrifice of the families of those who wear the uniform of the United States.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 159, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 27, WITHDRAWING APPROVAL OF THE UNITED STATES FROM AGREEMENT ESTABLISHING THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 304 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 304

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 27) withdrawing the approval of the United States from the Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. The joint resolution shall be debatable for two hours equally divided among and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Representative Paul of Texas, and Representative Sanders of Vermont or their designees. Pursuant to section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 and section 125 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.J. Res. 27 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate

only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 304 is a rule providing for 2 hours of general debate on H.J. Res. 27, withdrawing the approval of the United States from the agreement establishing the World Trade Organization, to be equally divided among and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

The rule provides that during consideration of H.J. Res. 27 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this fair rule, but in opposition to the underlying H.J. Res. 27, withdrawing the approval of the United States from the agreement establishing the World Trade Organization.

In 1994, Congress passed the Uruguay Round Table Agreements Act establishing the World Trade Organization, an independent body charged with monitoring and determining compliance with trade agreements. That law authorized the President to accept the United States' membership in the WTO and requires a report to be submitted to Congress every 5 years on the United States' participation in the WTO.

The law also offers Congress the opportunity every 5 years to assess whether continued membership in this organization is in the best interest of the United States. I believe that Members of the House should be afforded this opportunity to register their views on this question through a vote of the House, which I urge my colleagues to vote on in support of this rule.

The United States already has low tariffs, few subsidies, and a history of abiding bylaws and agreements. Our farmers and producers in my area in central Washington and across the country are some of the most efficient in the world and are capable of competing and winning in world markets, so long as they do not face foreign government policies like subsidies and dumping practices that stack the deck against them.

The enforcement of a rules-based trading system through the World Trade Organization is our best opportunity to gain access to these markets for our Nation's farmers and rural communities. The removal of artificial barriers to trade is of critical importance

to apple growers and tree fruit farmers in the agricultural-based economy in central Washington that I represent.

I am pleased that in 2003, the World Trade Organization stood up for the apple growers in central Washington and across the Nation by leveling the playing field in a dispute over Japan's import restrictions on imported U.S. apples. For nearly a decade, U.S. apple growers dealt with Japan's unjustified import requirements, which are imposed with no scientifically sound evidence. Trade restrictions should be based on scientific evidence and should be implemented on a limited basis, not used merely as tools to create unfair trade barriers.

The World Trade Organization ruled that Japan's restrictions were not justified and were in breach of their World Trade Organization obligations. This United States victory brought the hopes of meaningful access to Japan's markets to the domestic apple industry and will help us fight similar trade barriers in markets throughout the world.

Withdrawing from the World Trade Organization would result in our farmers, growers, and producers being shut out of these export opportunities and the loss of millions of jobs depending on them. Therefore, I believe that we must support our Nation's continued membership in the WTO and must continue aggressive enforcement of the rules of international trade. Our Nation's economy can continue to grow if we have access to global markets on a level playing field.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues look around the world today, I have no doubt most would agree that whether the subject is fully engaging our allies on matters of national security and diplomacy, working to protect our shared environment from global warming and other threats or striving to grow our economies in a fashion that is both efficient and humane, the United States should be playing a larger role in the world arena, not withdrawing from it.

Clearly, there are many areas in which the WTO needs reform. However, our continued participation is far too important for walking away to be considered a real option. Simply put, if America were to pull out of the WTO, we would be relegated to the small community of nations who are not members, losing any ability to influence the organization and its negotiations on a wide range of issues.

Ninety-seven percent of all U.S. trade is with other WTO members. No matter where you fall on trade issues these days, it is clear that our economic interests continue to lie with engaging our preeminent trading partners. And we must keep working to ensure that American companies that create jobs here at home by doing business overseas are able to do so in the most transparent, lawful, and predictable business environment possible.

In short, America's long-term economic interests are too important to disengage from this organization, and America is too great a Nation to send yet another signal to the world that we are withdrawing from the community of nations. In recent years we have already done that all too often.

So I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and all of the members of both parties on the Committee on Ways and Means for unanimously reporting this legislation with an adverse recommendation. I am pleased that both parties are prepared to make a strong statement about the importance of this Nation's continued engagement in the world economy.

Trade issues today are stirring a great deal of concern among Members of both parties, and my opponents in this debate are men and women of goodwill with real concerns that the American people's ability to maintain appropriate standards for their communities on issues from food safety to environmental protection will be undermined by the lower standards of other countries. These are worthy and real concerns, concerns that reflect the complexity and seriousness of these issues which have real consequences for our economy and our citizens.

America must be tough and smart and represent the interests of all our people in the trade arena, especially as we negotiate new trade agreements. Many Members of both parties in this Chamber have valid and important questions about whether our trade policymakers are doing that. But withdrawing from the WTO is not the answer.

Americans are right to demand that our negotiators look out for the broader community as the United States engages the world economically, but engage it we must. I am hopeful that today the House is prepared to reject this resolution on a bipartisan basis with a vote that will help preserve our leadership role in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1100

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from San Dimas, California (Mr. DREIER).

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in very, very strong opposition to what this resolution is attempting to do.

The great economist Milton Friedman once said, "Underlying most arguments against the free market is a lack of belief in freedom itself." Now, Mr. Speaker, if we listen carefully to the reasons we commonly hear for abandoning our open trade agenda, it becomes very clear that Milton Friedman was absolutely right.

We hear these claims all the time: Free trade agreements will leave working families without good jobs. Trade liberalization will weaken worker rights in developing countries. Lowering barriers to open trade will devastate the environment.

The underlying claim is that greater economic freedom will harm Americans and our trading partners alike, but this fear of freedom is not based in fact.

Following World War II, the world's major trading partners came together, the global leaders, and established the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the GATT. This agreement was designed to establish an international system of fair trade rules, pursuing that goal of the complete elimination of tariff and nontariff barriers, providing a forum for trading partners to settle any disputes that existed. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was the predecessor to what is now known as the World Trade Organization. Through trade liberalization that the GATT and the WTO have enabled, with the existence of those, have seen average tariffs in industrialized countries go from 40 percent down to 4 percent, spurring a six-fold increase in global GDP.

And, of course, remember, a tariff is a tax, so by reducing that tariff burden, through the goal of the GATT and now the WTO, we have been able to reduce the tax burden on consumers throughout the world. So we have seen, by virtue of that 40 percent to 4 percent reduction, a six-fold increase in gross domestic product growth.

Since the creation of the World Trade Organization 11 years ago, U.S. exports have increased by \$300 billion. We have seen our exports since the establishment of the WTO increase by \$300 billion. Over this time period, exports have come to support over 25 percent of the economic growth that we enjoy in the United States. Remember, we have a, virtually, almost \$11 trillion economy here in the United States. 25 percent of the growth in that economy is due to exports. Open trade and investment has netted an extra \$1 trillion in U.S. income every year, or about \$10,000 per household, as a result of those reductions that we have seen in tariff and nontariff barriers.

As the world's largest exporter and importer, the United States has the most to gain from the lower trade barriers and fairer global trade rules that the WTO brings. By reducing tariffs,

strengthening intellectual property protection, and increasing transparency in all of the 148 member countries, the WTO is our largest, most comprehensive, and most effective forum for expanding markets and creating new opportunities for Americans.

The WTO has also been an important tool for the United States in ensuring that international trade commitments are honored. Of the 47 WTO cases brought by the United States that have been concluded, 44 have been resolved in our favor. That is a 94 percent success rate for the United States of America within the structure of the World Trade Organization.

Our WTO membership has been absolutely critical in maintaining our global economic leadership. With 80 percent of the world's economy and 95 percent of the world's consumers outside of the United States, our role in the WTO remains essential to opening new markets and expanding existing ones for U.S. producers, service providers, and investors.

But the WTO is not our only forum for liberalizing trade rules and expanding foreign markets for American goods and services. The Free Trade Agreement negotiating process has long been highly successful in opening up new opportunities for Americans. We are on the forefront of I hope passing the Dominican Republic Central American Free Trade Agreement, which is critical to continuing on that path of prosperity that began with the GATT back in 1947 and has continued through the WTO, the North American Free Trade Agreement, and a wide range of bilateral agreements that we have put together over the past several years with Israel, Jordan, Chile, Singapore, Australia and Morocco, among others.

DR-CAFTA will make our trading relationship with the region reciprocal by granting U.S. producers the same access to their markets that the Dominican Republic-Central American producers have long enjoyed in ours. It will boost the competitiveness and productivity of American companies and workers by providing an export and investment destination that fully respects the rule of law and protects intellectual property rights.

But even more important, Mr. Speaker, it will empower the Dominican Republic-Central American countries to experience the economic growth, increased prosperity, and rising living standards that Americans have long enjoyed. All of the benefits of trade that I have described, greater family incomes, export-supported growth, transparent and fair trading rules for U.S. companies that participate in the global marketplace, these are all benefits, these are all benefits that our neighbors in Latin America deserve to enjoy along with us.

Again, there are many who will argue against greater economic freedom. They will say that it will cost American jobs. They will say that workers

and the environment and the DR-CAFTA bill will be devastating. They will in effect argue that the region is too poor to trade with us. But we cannot let this unfounded fear of economic freedom cause us to abandon our very important open trade agenda.

We are very fortunate to have our former colleague, Rob Portman, now serving as our ambassador, as the representative, the head of focusing on the whole issue of trade, the U.S. Trade Representative for us. We have to work closely with him, through the World Trade Organization, to tear down tariff and nontariff barriers to trade. We must continue to utilize this very important forum to ensure that our trading partners stick with their commitment. Living with a rules-based trading system is the only way that we are going to be able to vigorously pursue the diminution of those barriers to the free flow of goods and services throughout the world.

So, for the sake of the American people, for the sake of those throughout the world who are seeking to get onto the first rung of the economic ladder, it is absolutely imperative that the United States of America maintain its leadership role in the World Trade Organization.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for us to understand why this resolution is before us that brings forward H.J. Res. 27.

We are now celebrating the tenth anniversary of the creation of the World Trade Organization, the WTO. When Congress passed the legislation for us to join the WTO, Bill Clinton was President of the United States, and Newt Gingrich, Congressman Gingrich, thought it was important to have a mechanism in place where the Congress can exercise its independent authority over trade and that we should have an opportunity to carry out that responsibility by evaluating whether we want to stay in the World Trade Organization or not.

Mr. Speaker, I must tell my colleagues that when that issue was before us I had mixed thoughts as to whether we should have a nuclear option of withdrawing from the WTO or whether there are more effective ways for Congress to exercise its constitutional responsibility in an independent way over trade. I must tell my colleagues that I think that this process is going to be helpful.

So let me make it clear. I support the resolution to bring forward H.J. Res. 27 that has come out of the Committee on Rules. I very much oppose the passage of H.J. Res. 27, which would withdraw us from the WTO.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) pointed out and as the gentlewoman from California (Ms.

MATSUI) pointed out, it is in the United States' interests to be in a rules-based trading system, and we need to make sure that we continue United States participation within the WTO. However, we also need to understand that we need to improve and make more effective the WTO, and we also need to strengthen the manner in which we review the operations of the WTO.

We have had legislation that we could have acted on that would do that. I heard the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) give his analysis of the rulings within the WTO. Quite frankly, my score sheet is different. In two-thirds of the cases that have gone to dispute resolution panels or appellate panels, we have seen that they have overreached. That is, they have gone beyond the negotiated terms and ruled against U.S. interests.

I think we should have a review process of the WTO dispute settlement process. Senator DOLE had suggested that when he was in the United States Senate. I think we should look at that, and that would be a more effective way to have a continuing review in carrying out our responsibility as to whether the WTO is acting effectively to open up markets to all producers and manufacturers and farmers.

We also need to look at the enforcement of our trade rules. We need to spend more effort on enforcement. China's manipulation of currency should be a direct interest to this body. The protection of intellectual property rights of American companies should be more aggressively pursued. We need to be more aggressive against European subsidies. We need to deal with the enforcement of our antidumping laws. All this can be done and should be done, and we should not wait every 5 years in order to review that.

We also need to expand the opportunities within the Doha Round that will be presented to us. We have to help U.S. service industries so they can gain access to foreign markets. We need to work on tariff and nontariff barriers for U.S. manufacturers.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution, to vote against House Joint Resolution 27 so that we can move forward to improving the WTO. I urge us to look at ways in which we can help U.S. manufacturers, U.S. producers, and U.S. farmers to gain greater access to the international markets. We need to do that on an ongoing basis, and the Congress needs to exercise its authority to make sure that we are as aggressive as possible at opening up markets for U.S. interests.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have no illusions that the resolution that we bring up tomorrow is going to win. Five years ago, when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) brought it up, I think we received 56 votes. I think we will probably do better tomorrow, but I do not think we are going to win. But I do think that this resolution that is coming up tomorrow, which I strongly support, is enormously important, because it is high time for the United States Congress to take a tough look at our trade policies, our membership in the WTO. I believe that any objective assessment will tell every Member of this body and the American people that our trade policies have failed the American worker, the American middle class in a disastrous way, and that it is high time to rethink our trade policies so that they begin to work for the middle class of this country and not just the CEOs of our major corporations.

Mr. Speaker, the middle class of the United States of America is collapsing. Poverty is increasing. Our trade deficit is soaring.

I find it amazing to hear the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) give his portrayal of what is going on in America and the world. He is very much at odds with what the American people perceive.

□ 1115

The average American worker is asking why, with an explosion of technology, with a huge increase in worker productivity, why is the average American worker working longer hours for lower wages? Why is it that real wages in the United States today are 7 percent lower than they were in 1973 for the bottom 90 percent of American workers?

Why is it that with all of this globalization and all of this free trade there are few middle-class families in America where women no longer have the option of staying home with their kids, but they have got to go into the workforce, where people in America are working two jobs, and three jobs just to pay the bills.

The reality of what is going on in America today is that globalization is not working for ordinary people. In the last 4 years alone in the United States, we have lost 2.8 million good-paying manufacturing jobs. Just yesterday, we learned that General Motors is now going to cut back on another 25,000 good-paying jobs for American workers.

Study after study shows that the new jobs that are being created are paying low wages, with minimal benefits, and the jobs that we are losing were good-paying jobs that had good benefits.

Now, the bottom line of this discussion is that, yes, international trade is a good thing. But it is a good thing when it benefits ordinary Americans. It is not a good thing when it simply makes the CEOs of large corporations even wealthier so that they can earn as much as 500 times what the average

American worker in their company makes. That is not a good thing.

When we talk about unfettered free trade, let us remember that every single year our trade deficit is going up and up and up. And the singular question that we have got to address is, does our trade policy work when American workers are being forced to compete against desperate people in countries like China who earn 30 cents an hour?

My friends, that is what this debate is about. Large corporations like General Electric, General Motors, all of those companies who are throwing American workers out on the street, they think this agreement is great, because they are moving to China lock, stock and barrel, hiring desperate people for pennies an hour, people who go to jail when they stand up for their political rights when they try to form a union.

And the result of that is an extremely unfair competitive situation against the needs of the American worker.

My friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), talked about the need to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement, CAFTA. Well, I think he is going to be disappointed, because I think that the results are so clear in terms of what NAFTA has done for American workers, what Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China have done for American workers, that not only are the American people catching on that CAFTA will be a continuation of a failed policy, I think the American people are demanding that it is time for Congress to represent workers and not just the big money interests.

I am not going to suggest that trade alone is the only reason for the decline of the middle class. But I will suggest that it is a very significant reason. The middle class in America will not survive unless we create good-paying jobs here. And what study after study suggests is that the new jobs that are going to be available to our kids are not going to be the high-tech information technology jobs, because they are off to India, they are off to China. The new jobs are going to be in Wal-Mart industry, in the service industry, where people are earning low wages with low benefits.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply conclude by saying this: all of the objective evidence in terms of job loss, in terms of the loss of good-paying jobs, in terms of the growing gap between the rich and the poor in America which is now wider than in any other industrialized country on Earth, wider in the United States than it has been the 1920s, all of that suggests that the economy is not working for the middle class.

My Republican friends talk about a robust economy. President George Bush has not created one new job in the private sector since he has been in office; he has lost jobs. All of the new jobs have been created in the govern-

ment. And it is obligatory upon us to analyze why our economy is failing the middle class, why poverty is increasing, why the gap between the rich and the poor is growing wider, why the new jobs that are being created are primarily low wage with poor benefits.

Trade is not the only cause of this problem, but it is a significant cause. We need a trade policy that reflects the interests of the middle class and working people of this country and not the CEOs who are busy sending our jobs to China.

Let me quote the CEO of General Electric, Jeffrey Immelt, several years ago. He said, that when I look to the future of General Electric, I see China, China, China.

Well, I think maybe Mr. Immelt should look to the United States for the future of GE, and GM and other corporations should do the same. We cannot continue to hemorrhage decent-paying jobs going to countries that do not have democracy, where people are forced to work for pennies an hour. We and the other industrialized world must do everything we can to uplift the poor of the world. But we do not have to sacrifice the middle class of this country as part of that process.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I just ask my friend from California, I have no more requests for time except for me to close. If she is prepared to yield back, I will be prepared to yield back.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The WTO reflects many years of development resulting in broad and bipartisan support for expanded trade. Participation is vital to America's interest, be it economic, strategic, or as an avenue to strengthen the rule of law in the world. There is certainly a need to improve the WTO, something I believe can be done.

But this will only be the case if we maintain an active presence in the WTO, engage in negotiations to strengthen American interests. In a few weeks, trade issues will again be before us as this Chamber considers the Central American Free Trade Agreement, or CAFTA.

We should not confuse the debate today about the WTO and the upcoming debate on CAFTA. These are both avenues to advance America's interests through trade partnerships. But CAFTA is a very good example of what can happen when the United States is not looking out for the interests of all of our people and the dangers that can pose for standards that previous generations of Americans worked so hard for and that we benefit from today.

CAFTA would undercut existing protections for workers and United States trade law by requiring only that countries enforce their existing labor laws, which in many cases fail to provide the most basic and internationally recognized protections. Our trade policy should benefit workers, not undermine them.

That is another debate for another day. I mention it only to demonstrate that issues related to international trade are complex, serious, and with real consequences for our economy and our people.

Participation in the WTO is vital to America's interest, be it economic, strategic, or to strengthen the rule of law in the world.

I would like to note while this rule provides for 2 hours of debate, that under our House rules, this resolution and other bills we debate under the procedures established by the Trade Act of 1974 are entitled to 20 hours of debate. While in this case, 20 hours is certainly not necessary, many Members of both parties in this Chamber have valid and important questions about whether our trade policymakers are protecting our interests.

I would hope that when other trade agreements come before this body, and they will, that Members will be able to fully debate the issues and not be limited by stringent time constraints.

I intend to vote against the underlying resolution because I believe that the WTO is essential to a strong rules-based trading system. I hope my colleagues would do as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, American workers produce goods that are second to none. However, our success in selling these goods in a global marketplace, and we have to admit that we are in a global market, is dependent on fair and open markets. The World Trade Organization continues to advance and create more fair and open markets.

While I oppose the underlying bill, Members of the Congress should have the opportunity today to examine the merits of the United States' participation in the WTO. The debate on House Resolution 27 is an important one, and one that should be had.

So I urge my colleagues to support the rule, House Resolution 304, and to oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2744, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 303 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 303

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the

House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2744) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with the colon on page 54, line 4, through "overseas" on line 9; section 749; page 81, lines 1 through 7; and beginning with "and" on page 81, line 11, through "programs" on line 17. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph or section, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph or section may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph or section. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1130

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. PUTNAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 303 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2744, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006.

According to the rule general debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, and waives all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in an appropriations

bill, except as specified in the resolution.

Under the rules of the House, the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph. After general debate, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The resolution authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to present for consideration this open rule for the agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 2006. As with most all appropriations bills, the Committee on Rules has once again afford the entire Chamber an opportunity to offer any amendment to this legislation that complies with the rules of the House.

Members of the House are permitted to come to the floor and bring forth any idea or change they wish to see in this legislation. I am pleased that rule provides a chance for all of our Members to express their views on how our Nation should prioritize spending in this area.

Article 1, section 9 of the United States Constitution says, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

Our Founding Fathers established the role of the Committee on Appropriations to ensure that our Nation's spending is subject to oversight and approval by its elected representatives. The committee plays an important role in determining the wise use of taxpayer funds.

I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA) and his subcommittee for the tremendously difficult work this year in bringing the spending bill under its budget allocation. The Congressional budget is an important tool of the Congress, allowing us to establish priorities for the coming fiscal year. It is always encouraging to see the budget and the appropriations process work together in tandem, allowing Congress to ensure that our government acts in a fiscally responsible manner.

The Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations has reported out a bill that provides important resources to ensure that our Nation's farmers and ranchers remain competitive in the 21st century. The legislation enhances our ability to safeguard our food supply and addresses the nutritional needs of women and children and the most disadvantaged in our country. The bill also works to maintain and build fiscal discipline.

H.R. 2744 continues to fund important projects at a level consistent with fiscal year 2005, allocating nearly \$17 billion plus \$83 billion in total mandatory spending. At the same time, it addresses needs such as the protection of health and safety. In an effort to combat harmful pests and disease that